



METROPOLITAN  
TRANSPORTATION  
COMMISSION

Joseph P. Bort MetroCenter  
101 Eighth Street  
Oakland, CA 94607-4700  
TEL 510.817.5700  
TTY/TDD 510.817.5769  
FAX 510.817.5848  
E-MAIL [info@mtc.ca.gov](mailto:info@mtc.ca.gov)  
WEB [www.mtc.ca.gov](http://www.mtc.ca.gov)

April 14, 2006

*Jon Rubin, Chair*  
San Francisco Mayor's Appointee

*John McLemore, Vice Chair*  
Cities of Santa Clara County

*Tom Ammiano*  
City and County of San Francisco

*Irma L. Anderson*  
Cities of Contra Costa County

*Tom Azumbrado*  
U.S. Department of Housing  
and Urban Development

*James T. Beall Jr.*  
Santa Clara County

*Bob Blanchard*  
Sonoma County and Cities

*Mark DeSaulnier*  
Contra Costa County

*Bill Dodd*  
Napa County and Cities

*Dorene M. Giacomini*  
U.S. Department of Transportation

*Scott Haggerty*  
Alameda County

*Anne W. Halsted*  
San Francisco Bay Conservation  
and Development Commission

*Steve Kinsey*  
Marin County and Cities

*Sue Lempert*  
Cities of San Mateo County

*Bijan Sartipi*  
State Business, Transportation  
and Housing Agency

*James P. Spering*  
Solano County and Cities

*Adrienne J. Tissier*  
San Mateo County

*Pamela Torliatt*  
Association of Bay Area Governments

*Shelia Young*  
Cities of Alameda County

*Steve Heminger*  
Executive Director

*Ann Flemer*  
Deputy Executive Director, Operations

*Andrew Fremier*  
Deputy Executive Director,  
Bay Area Toll Authority

*Therese W. McMillan*  
Deputy Executive Director, Policy

Barry Sedlik, Assistant Secretary  
Business, Transportation & Housing Agency  
980 Ninth Street, Suite 2450  
Sacramento, CA 95814-3520

Cindy Tuck, Assistant Secretary  
California Environmental Protection Agency  
1001 I Street  
Sacramento, CA 95812-2815

Dear Barry and Cindy:

This letter follows up our conversation on March 30 regarding the proposed deletion of the Interstate 580 truck lanes project from the latest (March 2006) version of the Goods Movement Action Plan: Phase II Progress Report (GMAP). In brief, we believe the project should be retained, and that compelling reasons for deleting it have not been provided by staff. The following underscores our reasons for requesting its reinsertion:

1. The project represents the second most congested corridor in the entire nine county Bay Area, and by far the most congested major freight corridor--beginning at the Port of Oakland at Interstate 880, linking to state highways 238 and interstate 580 and over the Altamont pass, and representing the major gateway between our region and the Central valley. As such, the proposed improvements would address all of the GMAP's current project criteria:
  - improve velocity
  - improve throughput
  - increase reliability
  - reduce congestion
  - reduce community impacts
  - improve connectivity (this, on a local and regional scale)
  - advance innovative technologies (this, included in the GMAP as part of operational improvements for the aforementioned Interstate 880).
2. Staff offered that the project had been deleted because it was "long-term". However, the GMAP's priority actions summary still lists many long-term actions as part of the overall approach to addressing goods movement needs. Most notably, you have retained a Southern California long-term project-- the 710-corridor improvement including dedicated truck lanes. This project is very

similar in nature and objectives to the I-580 truck lane project you deleted—making the action in our region even more unexplainable.

3. Finally, and perhaps more importantly, the proposal to delete this project undermines what I believed to be a core objective of the GMAP—to highlight those corridors of statewide import to goods movement in California, and to examine and support—over the long haul—those improvements needed in those corridors to advance freight movement, and redress any negative impacts in doing so. Clearly, the GMAP will remain an under funded plan, irrespective of the outcome of a 2006 state infrastructure bond—long range strategies are intended to guide future investments over a number of years as revenues are advocated and (sometimes painstakingly) obtained. To deny a long-term, statewide commitment to what is clearly one of Northern California's greatest freight needs makes no obvious sense—particularly as commitment to a similar Southern California project of a much higher price tag (\$2.7 billion) is maintained. By comparison, the I-580 truck lane project is only \$65 million and complements investments made or planned in the 880/238/580 corridor of \$ 400 million, of which \$300 million are the regional county shares of the STIP, or local funds.

For these reasons, we request that the I-580 truck lane project be reinstated on the GMAPs list of preliminary candidate projects. Should you have any questions, please call me a (510) 817-5830.

Sincerely,



Therese W. McMillan  
Deputy Executive Director, Policy

cc: Commissioner Scott Haggerty  
Jack Broadbent, BAAQMD  
Richard Nordahl, Caltrans  
Bruce Kern, EDAB  
Jim Wunderman, Bay Area Council  
Jerry Bridges, Port of Oakland  
Dennis Fay, Alameda CMA